New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements.

MONDAY, MAY 8, 1916.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Ogden Reid, President; G. Vernor Rogers, Vice-President; R. H. Waldo, Secretary; F. A. Suter, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.

Daily & Sunday, 1 mo.	$ .75	Daily only, 1 month	$ .50
Daily & Sunday, 6 mos.	4.25	Daily only, 6 months	3.00
Daily & Sunday, 1 year	8.50	Daily only, 1 year	6.00
Sunday only, 6 months	1.25	Sunday only, 1 year	2.50

FOREIGN RATES		CANADIAN RATES	
DAILY AND SUNDAY		DAILY AND SUNDAY	
One month	$1.84	One month	$ .75
One year	22.05	One year	8.50
SUNDAY ONLY.		DAILY ONLY	
Six months	3.35	One month	.50
One year	6.60	One year	6.00
DAILY ONLY.		SUNDAY ONLY.	
One month	1.20	One month	.25
One year	15.20	One year	2.50

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

After the Primary.

Several months ago The Tribune asked of Republicans, "Do they want Roosevelt?" At the time we asked the question Colonel Roosevelt was the one man in the United States who was squarely and uncompromisingly meeting the issues raised by the German attack upon American lives and liberties.

A few weeks ago The Tribune answered for itself the question it had asked. As an American newspaper which placed American traditions and American ideals above all the parochial questions of party faction it accepted Colonel Roosevelt as the one man in public life whose leadership, whose spoken word, whose past conduct in public office, gave promise of a national administration faithful to the best in our history and competent to deal with the greatest crisis since the Civil War.

One week ago The Tribune asked of its readers a frank and free expression of their opinion as to the man who should be named by the Republicans at the approaching national convention. To-day The Tribune submits the answers it has received, the figures tabulated and collected with every regard that this newspaper could show for obtaining a fair count which should not be affected in any degree by the editorial position it had taken.

The readers of The Tribune will draw their own conclusions. The politicians and the party leaders will ignore or consider these returns as they please. They have not in recent years been so intelligent or so well intentioned as to give too great hope for the immediate future.

For itself The Tribune sees in these figures a cross-section of Republican sentiment. It believes that Colonel Roosevelt will be nominated at Chicago if the voters of the Republican party are permitted to express their desires and have their wishes met. It believes that the demand for the nomination of Colonel Roosevelt has marched steadily forward in recent months. It finds in its own experience, in the sentiment of its readers, final answer to the familiar suggestion that the popularity of Colonel Roosevelt, a few weeks ago on the gain, had passed its crest.

In the last two years there has been no man in public life who has been so frequently right as Colonel Roosevelt on the great problems that have come to this nation. He has not modified his faith to placate the German, not amended his demands for the maintenance of national honor to satisfy the pacifist or reassure the mercenary. He has not been afraid to be an American, when Americanism seemed to accept the inspiration of Potsdam. He has remained faithful to the Americanism of 1775 and 1861 when it had become fashionable to regard our past as annulled by a Germanic present.

The Tribune believes Colonel Roosevelt should be nominated. It now finds its readers in overwhelming agreement with its own conviction. The platform on which it believes the next Republican nominee should stand was not made for it. The Tribune has steadily affirmed its faith and its purposes. It accepts Colonel Roosevelt as its candidate because it finds him in accord with its views on the main issues. It accepts him not because of what he did in 1904 or in 1908; it accepts him in spite of what he did in 1912, because it believes that in 1916 he best represents a sturdy, courageous Americanism, which has been and must continue to be the basis of our national existence. Other men may perhaps decide hereafter to adopt the principles now advocated by Colonel Roosevelt, but in all the storm and passion of the recent months, when nearly every man in public life thought first of votes and only last of principles, Colonel Roosevelt has stood squarely by the principles and let the votes go hang. He has written most of all that the next Republican platform must contain.

The Tribune believes he is the man who should stand on that platform, and it finds new strength for its conviction in the vote of its readers.

Protecting the People's Parks.

It is to be hoped the annual park "clean up crusade" by the Park Commissioners and the police in cooperation will have lasting results. It ought to be unnecessary to set apart days on which violators of the park regulations must be arrested as an example to the rest of the community, yet the necessity exists. There seems to be an ignorant or disorderly element in the community which can be restrained from littering park walks and lawns and from pulling flowers and shrubs to pieces only by the sight of a policeman waiting to make an arrest.

This is doubly unfortunate—unfortunate for the parks and unfortunate for the public, which otherwise might obtain a far freer use of the city's parks. The city has a tremendous investment in its parks and playgrounds. They should be used in many ways for and by the public which seem impossible now, though they have been found possible in other cities. There appears to be lacking here a general and fundamental understanding of the fact that the parks belong to the people, and that in harming them any individual is destroying something of value to himself. The full value of the investment will be obtainable only when the public has developed a sense of responsibility for their preservation as keen as that exercised by the citizen regarding the well-being of his own property.

A Return to Reason.

It is hard to see what the clothing manufacturers have gained by their lockout, which precipitated the present general strike. The situation, it is true, has now been thrust far beyond a technical discussion of whether factories should be run on a basis of what the union terms "preferential union shops"—that is, with union men in good and regular standing having preference in "hiring and firing," which amounts, according to the employers, to an actual closed shop, with the manufacturers serving in effect as collecting agents for the union. But sooner or later the lockout, or strike, will come to a point where again arbitration will have to be taken up. At that time the employers will have to meet in conference for discussion of the trade problems and their bearing on public welfare very much the same group of disinterested citizens whom they refused to treat with at Mayor Mitchel's suggestion.

Meantime the manufacturers have certain tactical advantages. Work has been stopped when they chose rather than at the time most advantageous to the union. They will not contract with customers for the delivery of goods for the fall trade until a settlement is reached, and most of them will escape the cost of making up samples for that trade—unless the settlement is reached in good time for them. Their house is in order. But all this does not mean that the inevitable time of arbitration, of treaty-making, will not arrive. Can the tactical advantages offset the cost and disturbance of the strike, the bitterness which will attend it and inevitably tinge any future negotiations, and, quite as important, the prevalent feeling on the part of a good portion of the public that the manufacturers really precipitated the crisis by declining to go to the limit in conference with the Board of Conciliation, even though they held to their original position?

The present conflict represents violence, or war, in contrast with arbitration, the endeavor to settle disputes by reason, under the protocol. Yet when all the waste and bitterness of violence have passed reason must again be called into play. Disinterested persons can only regret, for the sake of employers, employes and the public, that it was banished temporarily, and must hope fervently that reason will be recalled before the waste and violence entail heavy losses on all parties.

Hope for the Century.

The white elephant at the corner of Sixty-second Street and Central Park West has trampled on a long series of rash theatrical managers. Cheerful courage is the first gift that New York will concede to Messrs. Dillingham and Ziegfeld in taking over the Century Theatre. If they can discover the secret of success for that tomb of large expectations they will deserve a real vote of thanks from a public that has too often gone and seen and sorrowed.

Heretofore the huge pile has overwhelmed almost everything that has entered its doors. As we read the plans of its new lessees, they propose to conquer the vast block by packing it with every species of light, noise and entertainment known to Broadway. This has the right sound. With spots to dance upon and restaurants to eat in and musical comedy to sit through who can say that the whole mastodonic structure may not begin to dance and sing. Berlin, copying Paris, has reared such mighty palaces of joy, and Americans, returning in a happier day, found much to praise in them. After all, the combination is little more than Omar's notion of Paradise carefully translated into the terms of a more complex civilization. Why should it not prosper in the wilderness of Broadway?

Rumors in War Time.

The entertaining "Wayfarer," of the London "Nation," says that while Mayfair generally has been the headquarters "for the propagation of malicious nonsense," he has never known it so silly and scandalous as it is in these days. Of the rumors current he notes these among others: That Lord Haldane's son has been shot as a spy; that Miss Asquith is engaged to the son of Count Zeppelin; that Mrs. McKenna is German, and that "that is why she is so fond of German music," and that the Queen Elizabeth has been sunk. And he is evidently astonished that people are so ready to believe these wild tales.

Why should he be? The conditions are peculiarly favorable for the popular reception of extravagant rumors, and many rumors more improbable, more obviously grotesque, have been swallowed cheerfully by the multitude since the war began. One circumstance that shows how credulous people are likely to be in war time is the success achieved by all sorts of soothsayers and prophets and impostors. In the early days of the war they attracted more attention in Paris than they do to-day, but every one remembers how seriously various prophecies were discussed by people not at all inclined to be superstitious in ordinary times. Mme. de Thèbes had a considerable vogue, and even the ridiculous and obviously spurious document palmed off on the public by the Sar Peladan was accepted for a while as worthy of debate.

In England pious people and spiritists were interested in the Angels of Mons, though drawn directly from a story that made no pretence to be anything but fiction. Since then the most reckless and notorious liars have had a respectful hearing. Lord Haldane's son is but the latest of the long list of spies, including Cornwallis West, Grahame White, Sandow, the strong man, and countless numbers of more or less eminent persons. Every one remembers the positive testimony of scores of truthful witnesses who with their own eyes had seen the Russian army in Scotland. Even so sober and judicious a writer as M. Maurice Maeterlinck has but lately been discoursing at length on "Supernatural Communications in War Time," and, though he has little to relate in the way of fact, he is plainly convinced that spiritual clairvoyance *ought* to be possible in war time.

A celebrated psychiatrist, Dr. Bernard Hart, pointed out lately at a meeting of a scientific society that not all fabrications of this sort are to be ascribed to deliberate falsehood or malice. He spoke of the singular susceptibility of crowds to the herd instinct, remarking that this herd instinct was stimulated to a maximum degree in a great war. It may be added, by the way, that a considerable proportion of the fantastic stories that have gained currency of late are easily analyzable as imaginary fulfilments of popular wishes.

A Lesson to Dog Owners.

An open protest against the Department of Health is made by a woman who has lately had the misfortune to lose her dog—a dog, she explains, "with the stoutest heart in the world and the best friend a man or woman ever had." This stout-hearted dog bit a little boy and was placed under observation for a week. It was then returned to its owner and presently manifested signs of distemper and died. She is satisfied that the disease was acquired while the dog was under the care of the department, and "I would feel," she writes, "that I was untrue to the memory of my little friend if I did not let those who love dogs as much as I know how he came to his end."

The most remarkable thing in her protest is not her hasty assumption that the dog was infected while under observation, but her utter inability to see that the human victim of the dog was entitled to any consideration. The little boy, it seems, tried to pick up a ball the dog was playing with and got his desserts—"a nip for his pains," as she puts it. Every one, she thinks, ought to know that dogs bite when robbed of their toys, and it offends her greatly that "because of the ignorance of this urchin the poor dog had to be turned over to the Department of Health."

A more careful analysis of the facts should convince her that her own ignorance, her ignorance of the law, or her defiance of it, was the real cause of all the trouble. It is enacted by the Board of Health that no unmuzzled dog shall be permitted to be on any public highway or in any public place or park. If she had obeyed the law her dog would not have been taken away, and though he might have died of distemper, he would not have died, as she imagines he did, "blaming her to the very last for the suffering he had undergone." If the dog had any such fancy, the dog was right.

"G. W. S."

Some Reminiscences by Moreton Frewen, in "The London Spectator."

George Washington Smalley has been for now forty years a connecting link between England and the United States, and I think a few lines as to his last hours and where he stood amid this amazing wreckage of things will be welcomed by his friends on both sides. During his last few days the writer was a fairly constant visitor. He was evidently approaching the great crossing, and this with regret. His faculties were quite unimpaired, and his "unsatisfied curiosity" as to what is just over the bar was extraordinarily stimulated. Smalley's eyes had failed him, and it was left to his friends to construe for him the march of events which were clean outside all his wide studies and experiences. Smalley was always a Pope, and his defect as an exponent of international matters was in his unwillingness to transmit news! "What chiefly alarms me," Lincoln once said, "is not the Judgment Day, but the day of no judgment." Smalley had for half a century been reviewing those frequent spasms of "no judgment," to which the American democracy is much more prone than ours. He was going out, he felt, at a moment when all the weaknesses of the American Constitution stood revealed. Thus he was greatly impressed and greatly depressed. The entire "moral idea" for which The New York Tribune stood appeared to be doomed. I had known him very intimately for a quarter of a century. His critical faculty and his uneasy political exactitudes made him, and particularly at Washington, more enemies than friends. That it should have been left to such a man to balance for "The Times" the relations of John Hay and the Senate! Looking back on it, the position was high comedy. Yet no one knew the inner life there better, but his reluctance to report what shocked his sense of the fitness of things greatly reduced his value as a mere correspondent in times of crisis. To Lord Pauncefote he was invaluable at the time when Holleben, the German Ambassador, was quite openly laying the foundations at enormous cost of a reptile press and hyphenated vote. But these are matters of history, and the time has not arrived when they can safely come under review.

I recall with much amusement meeting him one evening at a party in one of the great Fifth Avenue palaces. Smalley, with an old man's air of deprecation, said to his hostess: "Your gatherings—they are too large and too late for me." That delightful companion, the late Senator Wolcott, who was talking to me, said: "But what he prefers to the small and early is the Earl and Smalley"! I moved over and told our friend this mot at his expense. He entered into the spirit of it and said: "Wolcott is right, though something depends on the Earl!" The very last talk I had with him he devoted to the possibility of the nomination of Roosevelt this year. When Roosevelt went out in 1909, the Whig element in the Republican party, which element, of course, Smalley voiced, thought that a nightmare administration which threatened everything valuable in the Constitution, and especially the judiciary, had gone and had done its worst. The other day I was interested to find that, albeit his preference was for Root, he had reconsidered his whole attitude as to Roosevelt, and he thought that the reunion of the Republican party under one or the other was necessary if the United States were to survive.

THE LAST GERMAN NOTE

And the Proper Way for the United States to Answer It.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Of the German note one thing may be said: It seems very easy to answer. Of course, it must be answered, or we will appear to accept its conditions.

The note states, not that Germany will issue, but that she has issued, an order to her naval forces intended to put a stop to the methods of undersea warfare of which we complained. We need not be hypercritical of the text of the order; we should assume that it is intended in good faith to accomplish that result. If, as construed, it does not do so, that fact will soon be made manifest. Therefore, on the day we send our reply, the situation will be that Germany, so far as we know, is conducting that warfare in conformity with our requests.

With this result we may express great satisfaction, inasmuch as it permits the continuance of diplomatic relations, thus making it possible for the two nations to come to some accord with regard to various regrettable occurrences in the past.

It might then be stated that we regret to learn from the note that this abandonment of the methods complained of may be only temporary. It is for Germany to determine how long such abandonment shall last. That all this country has to say on the main question has already been said in our prior notes; that presumably all Germany has to say is to be found in her notes, and that further exchange of communications on that question seems unnecessary. That should Germany, either by revoking these new instructions, or by a loose construction of their terms, resume the methods of which we complained, the situation will be precisely as it was before this last reply was received, and such resumption will be tantamount to a refusal of the request contained in our note of April 18. That, in such an event, as was indicated in our said note, diplomatic relations between the two countries will cease.

In this way it will be left for Germany, not for ourselves, to press the button, or not to do so. Moreover, if the button is pressed the result will be action, not words. Really, we are about "fed-up" with words.

E. HENRY LACOMBE.

New York, May 6, 1916.

A Modern Use of It.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I note in your issue of this date an inquiry from J. W. M. as to the origin of the expression, "Put only Americans on guard to-night."

My recollection of the circumstance is as follows:

In 1858 the citizens of Quarantine Landing on Staten Island, now known as St. George, determined to abolish the quarantine that existed on the island, and to resort to a very effectual method—to burn down the three large buildings used for the purpose of caring for the sick brought to the Port of New York by ships from domestic and foreign ports (yellow fever being the most objectionable). The determination of the natives of Staten Island was carried out one night and the buildings referred to entirely destroyed.

From one of the residents of the island I heard the next morning that the patients in the hospital buildings were carefully removed from the same and placed under the trees, before fire was set to the buildings.

This act was considered by my informant as one that demonstrated the high regard the citizens of Staten Island had for the care and comfort of the unfortunate patients under the care of the quarantine authorities.

The destruction of the buildings necessitated immediate action. Temporary sheds were erected and to guard them the militia was called out. Among the first to report for duty was the 69th Regiment, N. G., S. N. Y., commanded by Colonel Michael Corcoran, who, on the first night, in placing his men for guard duty, gave the well known order to "Place none but Americans on guard to-night." The 69th Regiment being at that period, as at present, composed of Irishmen, the order of "Colonel Mike" was hailed as the best joke of the season, particularly when given with the true "Irish vernacular."

This event, occurring at the time of the Sepoy mutiny in India, was dubbed the "Sepoy Rebellion," and the Staten Islanders who participated were called "Sepoys."

I note recently in a newspaper that one of the "Sepoys," who now is interested in the subject of a garbage disposal plant on Staten Island, recalls with evident pleasure that "fifty years ago he witnessed the destruction of the quarantine hospital buildings." He no doubt recalls the order of Colonel Corcoran as I have given it.

WILLIAM R. COCK.

Plainfield, N. J., April 28, 1916.

Of What Avail?

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: A poll to show how many Republicans are for this candidate or that candidate as a first choice for President proves little as to the strength of the candidate. The man of large and ardent following is often the man of large and ardent opposition, as witness Blaine in many conventions, and in the election of 1884, and Grant at the convention of 1880.

The best test of availability of candidates would be to prepare a ballot presenting the names of all candidates for the Republican nomination and ask persons who consider themselves Republicans to indicate on the ballot the names of those they are willing to vote for if nominated. This is a consideration which is likely to have weight with the next Republican National Convention.

What does it avail a man to have 10,000 boosters when there are 10,000 knockers within his own party who will be inclined to "do" him good while the boosters are doing him "good"?

L. Y. COATES.

Winchester, Ind., May 1, 1916.

Alcohol and Crime.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In a letter published in the issue of your paper for April 23 the Rev. William Milton Hess makes the assertion that "every one knows that the use, and not only the abuse, of alcoholic beverages is the cause of 80 per cent of crime and evil."

If Mr. Hess will furnish statistics compiled by the Federal or state governments or by any other reliable authority that will substantiate this statement I will gladly pay $1,000 to any charity that he may name. I am sure that he does not believe that the cause of temperance can be helped by exaggerated claims or unfounded assertions, and if he finds that he has been deceived by the reckless charges that constitute the stock-in-trade of the prohibition agitators I trust that he will promptly acknowledge his error.

H. J. KALTENBACH,
President New York State Wholesale Liquor Dealers' Association.

New York, May 2, 1916.

"Frozen Truth."

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Your editorial in to-day's Tribune "British Failure" should be distributed as widely as possible.

Put it in leaded type and in pamphlet form, so that it will be available to mail. Indorse it "Frozen Truth—A Patriot's Vade Mecum."

A. B. CARRINGTON.

New York, May 1, 1916.

THE INQUIRY.

ROOSEVELT AND AMERICANISM

He Is Best Identified with the Issue and Can Do Most to Arouse, Educate and Inspire His Countrymen—The Spirit of America Must Be Represented in Our Next President.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I think you are right in advocating the nomination of Theodore Roosevelt. There are three things needful of accomplishment in the approaching campaign: First, the election of a man capable of carrying into effect virile and American policies; second, and more important, the establishment of such policies as the definite choice of the people, these policies to be chiefly dignified insistence upon American rights abroad and the necessary preparation at home to enable us to obtain these rights by the ability to use force, or in the last extreme by force itself; third, and far the most important of all, the reflex effect upon the people of the country of worthy ideals at Washington and the immediate invigoration which voting for such ideals will bring to them.

As to the first of these needs, there are many men who could fill the bill. Personally, I consider Mr. Root the ablest public man in the United States. But his early corporation affiliations, his part in the miserable convention at Chicago four years ago, and his advanced age would make him a weak candidate. He can be of most value to the country in the office of Secretary of State. Burton or McCall might be able to give a good administration, but neither has the essential magnetism now required. Hughes undoubtedly has the ability, but his temperament is judicial, of which we have had a-plenty, and his position makes it impossible for him to declare himself upon the controlling issues of this election, issues in regard to which the position of any candidate for the nomination must be unquestionable. No man who has not been outspoken in support of democracy against Kaiserism, of the rights of unoffending nations in general and American rights in particular, ought to be considered.

The policies of the new administration, the platform upon which the President must be elected, must be such as to win respect for our nation and safety for our citizens abroad, and preparedness at home to enable us to perform the responsibilities of a great nation. Political necessity will doubtless couple with these paramount issues of Americanism some doctrines of which many of us entirely disapprove, but their importance is insignificant. I, for instance, entirely disbelieve in the theory and practice of tariff protection, but what does it matter alongside of the justification of our national existence? Questions of our pocketbooks should be forgotten where we have to deal with questions of our honor.

The truly important thing, however, is neither the identity of our President nor the establishment of our policies, but the awakening of the soul of our nation. The old America had in it much of the heroic; this same spirit exists to-day if only it can be aroused. We have enough of pink-tea, man-milliner, Harold-and-Percy, grape-juice-uber-alles conduct of our affairs; we must get back to the homespun virtues of our forebears, of which courage and virility were not the least. The important thing is not the President who is to represent the Spirit of America, but the Spirit of America which is to be represented in the President. Now, more than at any time since 1860, the very fact of our efforts to elect a President worthy of our history can have a powerful influence in broadening ourselves and making us worthy in like manner.

A Ford-jitney administration has done all that it could to make us a jitney people; we need some one of a 100-horsepower to bring us back. And for our own sakes, not for his, we need a man who has been duly advertised as of 100-horsepower size, so that in voting for him we may realize that we are voluntarily choosing to have nothing to do with the side-car motorcycle outfits. It is even more important that we should believe that our candidate is big and strong and American and brave than that he should actually be so, because voting for him in this belief will help to make us big and strong and American and brave ourselves.

The one man who stands forth pre-eminent to the American people as the embodiment of stanch and fearless Americanism is Theodore Roosevelt. It would make no difference to me, even if I believed many of the accusations his opponents bring against him, even if I thought him selfish or bombastic or unstable in small matters or too eager for popular applause. Much less should I heed the charge that he has been false to the Republican party; parties matter nothing, they are things of politics to which, at this time, we have got to rise superior. I want Roosevelt, not because I want him to be given the Presidency, but because I believe that the people in deliberately voting for him will arouse in themselves those dormant qualities of Americanism upon which rests the future of our nation. At the same time, it is not a matter of mere opinion that Roosevelt can administer our affairs with courage, dignity and safety. He has proved that he can do so because he has done so.

Roosevelt's revivalist abilities are what we most need now. He, more than any other man, can create an enthusiasm for true American ideals. The important thing is to bring out this enthusiasm; the result of this enthusiasm in the election of any particular man is merely secondary.

The story goes that Colonel Roosevelt on being asked what he would have done if he had been President when the Lusitania was sunk, replied that if he had been President at that time the Lusitania would not have been sunk. Most of us believe that this is so; that Mr. Wilson's quake-kneed and apologetic procrastination served only to invite outrage. I believe that an expression by the American people of their determination to put an end once and for all to weakness and timidity in our attitude toward foreign nations will go far to restore our prestige and our usefulness and do more than anything else to make peace honorable and possible. The man who more than any other can make such an expression of the people ringing and unmistakable is Theodore Roosevelt. The world will know what we mean when we elect Theodore Roosevelt.

BENJAMIN APTHORP GOULD.

New York, May 1, 1916.

A Statesman for President.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: A short time ago much publicity was given to the starting of a campaign for a business man for President. The Business Men's Presidential League is now booming the idea with circulars and cards. "For President," says a card, "a man who does big things in a big way; not a man who talks big words in a loud voice."

A statement which every true American should resent is contained in one of their circulars. It is to the effect that the United States is just a "big business corporation." One idea is kept to the front—that this nation is "the biggest business concern the world ever saw." God forbid, though, that economic and mercantile matters form the pivotal idea of the country! No one should be remiss in understanding that we engage in business to live, but we do not live for business. Our enthusiasm and ideals are by no means controlled by business interests, and the thought that humanity is bound up in industry is, to say the least, disrespectful.

The Presidential job now, as ever, calls for a statesman. A well trained statesman will know the people. His experience will give him an intelligent perception of business affairs. He should be a diplomat. We can see at the present time how the slightest quiver in the wrong direction of our international relations will bring immediate disaster. Where does the business man come in here? Likewise many forces in society need delicate handling by one whose knowledge goes deeper than money and property.

The nation is made up of all of us, and to have a business man as chief would not be truly representing the people. A sailor is not Secretary of the Navy nor is a soldier first man in the army. A fully equipped captain or general in either capacity might have little respect for other people's rights.

Let us preserve and develop our nationalism, unity and co-operation by continuing to elect statesmen for President.

THEODORE MICHEL.

Brooklyn, April 28, 1916.

AMERICAN INDIAN DAY

Senator Poindexter Approves Celebration of Second Saturday in May.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I am inclosing to you a part letter from United States Senator Poindexter on American Indian Day.

I hope you help me to get this before the people at large, through the press. I have letters I can show you. Various Governors have indorsed it.

Hoping you will assist me as to the American Indian Day, by you through the press.

RED FOX JAMES.

New York, May 3, 1916.

"On the second Saturday in May will be American Indian Day. For the first time in American history have the natives of this country taken upon themselves to set aside one day of each year to be dedicated to the North American Indians. They are calling upon the people of many races under 'Old Glory' to observe this day in their honor and the memory of their great ancestors.

"The Society of American Indians, at their fifth annual conference, at Lawrence, Kan., requested their president, Sherman Coolidge, (Arapahoe), to name a day. Red Fox James, a blood Indian of the Blackfeet Nation, of Montana, rode 4,006 miles on his pony, collected from twenty-four Governors letters indorsing 'American Indian Day' and presented them to the White House on December 14, 1914.

"It is a day when spring has perfected the year and when blossoms and flowers promise the continuation of Nature's plan. It is the old planting festival, the springtime ceremony of all the tribes. It is the day when Nature has made herself known for all her children.

"This day can be celebrated by Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts and Camp Fire Girls, by the Improved Order of Red Men, by Patriotic Order of Sons of America, and by other historical societies may meet to discuss the Indian as a man and American. The Indian has a right to call upon this nation to honor his past. These first Americans of this land at first everywhere welcome those who came to be Americans. Let all Americans remember this. Hostility did not come until white man had wronged the red man. Why not all observe 'American Indian Day' as any other great 'memorial day' is observed.

"I heartily concur in what my Indian friend Red Fox James says and in the excellent movement he has put on foot for setting aside every year a day to be devoted to the American Indian—his history, traditions, interests and enjoyments. They are the earliest Americans and their contribution of a distinct type enriches the great composite of our citizenship. Many encomiums have been spoken of the American Indian, the original owner of what is now the United States, and all are deserved. He possessed many traits of character which may be well emulated by his white fellow citizens, and all should unite in preserving to the memory what he was and what he has done. It is eminently fit and proper that a day should be set aside each year for that purpose."

The Death of a Loyal American.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: John Mitchel was a powerful young man of six feet and over; strong in every fibre, the picture of health, and every inch a soldier. He was color sergeant of the 27th Michigan Volunteers. At the battle of Cold Harbor, Va., June 3, 1864, a minie ball penetrated his right knee, causing a profuse flow of blood. Carried by four of his comrades, he was brought on a stretcher to the field hospital. Shot an hour or two previous, the writer had preceded him to the same place and witnessed his approach. Going at once to his side, I asked, for we were chums, if I could be of any service. The dying man raised his eyes toward me and answered: "Write my mother not to mourn for me." He spoke in whispers, for the rattle of death was fast smothering his speech. "Tell her I died facing the enemy, holding aloft the old flag which means so much to every loyal American." John Mitchel's eyes widened, his breath ceased, he was gone.

Is the spirit that animated John Mitchel and thousands of others in those trying times dead? Our flag is insulted at home and abroad, on land and on sea. Our citizens are sunk on the ocean and shot on their own soil, and what steps are taken to put a stop to such humiliations? Notes, notes, notes; nothing but notes!

JAMES W. PUTNAM.

New York, April 30, 1916.